

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and following remarks.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. All of the pending claims have been rejected.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-10, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,442,413 to Tejima et al. ("Tejima") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,942,157 to Sutherland et al. ("Sutherland").

The Examiner repeatedly indicates that Tejima teaches each and every elements of the present invention except a hologram as a diffracting optical element having a diffracting portion sandwiched between a pair of transparent plates. Sutherland is cited as disclosing a hologram as a diffractive optical element having a diffracting portion sandwiched between a pair of transparent plates.

Tejima discloses a projecting optical system in which a conjugate-coupling optical element 30 is positioned between a first projection lens system 10 and a second projection lens system 20. An image from the second projection lens system 20 is formed on a tilted screen 22. It is explained in Tejima that the optical element has a positive power and a prism function to deflect a bundle of rays transmitted through the first projection lens system towards the optical axis of the second projection lens system to thereby couple pupils of the first and second

projection lens systems. Tejima further discloses the optical element is deviated from an intermediate image forming position by a predetermined offset in the optical axis direction thereof. See, for example, Figs. 1 & 2 and col. 2, lines 19-31 of Tejima.

As Applicant understands it, the Examiner seems to believe that using a hologram as a diffractive optical element having a diffracting portion sandwiched between a pair of transparent plates as recited in independent claims 1 and 13 is not patentably distinct because the same type of hologram is well known in the art as shown in Sutherland.

Each of claims 1 and 13 has been amended to read "tilt angle of said first projection optical system relative to said light deflecting means conforms to a Sheimpflug rule." Support for the amendment may be found, for example, the second paragraph of page 7 starting line 18 of the original specification.

Applicant believes that neither Tejima nor Sutherland show or suggest this aspect of the invention and each of claims 1 and 13 is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Tejima and Sutherland, either taken alone or in combination, for at least this reason.

In paragraph three (3) of the office action, claims 11, 12 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tejima in view of Sutherland, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,833,339 to Sarayeddine ("Sarayeddine").

Sarayeddine is cited as disclosing a plurality of reflecting mirrors. Applicant notes, however, that Sarayeddine in no where discloses the added feature of claims 1 and 13 from which claims 11, 12 and 15 depend.

Accordingly, each of claims 11, 12 and 15 is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious

PATENT

Application Serial No. 09/680,770  
Amendment dated July 25, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2003

in view of Tejima, Sutherland and Sarayeddine, either taken alone or in combination, for at least the reasons discussed above regarding claims 1 and 13.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicant has not individually addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicant submits that the foregoing places the independent claims from which they respectively depend in condition for allowance. Applicant however reserves the right to address such rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary.

PATENT

Application Serial No. 09/680,770  
Amendment dated July 25, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of April 25, 2003

**AUTHORIZATION**

No petitions or additional fees are believed due for this amendment and/or any accompanying submissions. However, to the extent that any additional fees and/or petition is required, including a petition for extension of time, Applicant hereby petitions the Commissioner to grant such petition, and hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees, including any fees which may be required for such petition, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500 (Order No. 1232-4651). **A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED.**

An early and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN LLP

Dated: July 25, 2003

By: Sungho Hong  
Sungho Hong  
Registration No. P-54,571

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN L.L.P.  
345 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10154  
(212) 758-4800